



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/523,410	03/10/2000	Geoffrey W. Simons	MLLTP006	4632
20322	7590	11/28/2005	EXAMINER	
SNELL & WILMER ONE ARIZONA CENTER 400 EAST VAN BUREN PHOENIX, AZ 850040001			SMITH, PETER J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2176	

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/523,410	Applicant(s) SIMONS, GEOFFREY W.	
	Examiner Peter J. Smith	Art Unit 2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 September 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: RCE amendment filed 9/12/2005.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending in the case. Claims 1 and 11 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. **Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hunt et al. (hereinafter "Hunt"), US 6,496,855 B1 priority filed 03/02/1999 in view of Kraemer, US 6,490,602 filed 01/15/1999 and Dedrick, US 5,710,884 filed 3/29/1995.**

Regarding independent claim 1, Hunt teaches accessing a first data profile containing a non-filtered set of data corresponding to a first user in col. 6 lines 44-52. Hunt also teaches the creation of different "personalities" which are filtered first data profiles wherein they contain a filtered set of data derived from the first data profile in col. 6 line 53 to col. 7 line 11. Hunt does not teach is coalescing data from a filtered first data profile and the data from a second data profile to construct a third data set wherein the third data set is used to complete an online form such that certain data items required by the online form relating to the first user are taken from the filtered first data profile portion of the third data set. Hunt also does not teach receiving a completed online form when the online form contains a modified data item, wherein the first data profile is updated with the modified data item.

Kraemer teaches in col. 4 lines 8-45 and also in col. 6 lines 16-33 and col. 6 line 58 – col. 7 line 10 that a third data set, referred to as a purchase command, is constructed from data relating to the gift receiver and data relating to the gift giver. The purchase command combines the gift-recipient information contained in the gift with the gift-giver information submitted by the gift-giver user prior to the generation of the purchase command, thus the two sets of data are coalesced into one set contained in the purchase order. Dedrick teaches receiving modified data items and updating a first data profile with the modified data items in col. 1 line 65 – col. 2 line 4 and col. 5 line 52 – col. 6 line 21. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hunt, Kraemer, and Dedrick to have enabled users to have shared profiles guided by privacy preferences including transaction information such as billing and shipping addresses to complete a gift-giving-gift-receiving transaction over the internet and to have automatically updated the first data profile in accordance with manual changes made on the form by the user as is taught by Dedrick.

It would have been very obvious and desirable to one of ordinary skill to have combined the teachings to have enhanced the user data profiles protected by privacy preference policies of Hunt with the gift registry method and apparatus of Kraemer and the automatic profile updating taught by Dedrick to have created the claimed invention. The person of ordinary skill in the art would have desired to make this modification to have enhanced the registry process by reducing the time required to complete a transaction. By using the profiles taught by Hunt the person of ordinary skill would have created a system which uses the datasets pertaining to the gift-receiver and the gift-giver to have automatically filled out the vendor forms instead of the gift-giver having entered the data required for the purchase order each time said gift-giver wished to

provide a gift for a gift-receiver. Dedrick would have improved the combination by allowing a more efficient updating of the data profile by automatic updating from monitoring the user profile.

Regarding dependent claim 2, Hunt teaches selecting particular data items from the non-filtered set of data that the first user intends to share with one or more computer network users. Computer network users of the websites which the data may be released to may be able to use the data which is released to the websites in col. 6 line 64 – col. 7 line 5.

Regarding dependent claim 3, Hunt teaches creating a filtered first data profile for a specific computer network user. The specific website which the first user's "personality" is set up for might be released only to another specific computer network user of that site in col. 6 line 64 – col. 7 line 5.

Regarding dependent claim 4, Hunt does not expressly teach that the specific computer network user is a gift giver and the first user is a gift receiver. Kraemer does teach that the specific computer network user is a gift giver and the first user is a gift receiver in col. 6 lines 16-57.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kraemer into Hunt to create the claimed invention. One skilled in the art would have been motivated to have set up an online gift registry using the profiles of Hunt where the specific computer network user is a gift giver and the first user is a gift receiver. This would have been very desirable to have allowed the gift giver to have purchased gifts for the gift receiver over the internet and not have had to travel to a store as previously was necessary to have purchased a gift through a gift registry for a gift recipient.

Regarding dependent claim 5, Hunt teaches in col. 6 line 53 – col. 7 line 10 that the privacy preferences of the “personalities” or filtered first data profiles are inherited from the first primary data profile privacy policies.

Regarding dependent claim 6, Hunt teaches in col. 6 line 53 – col. 7 line 10 that the privacy preferences attached to the filtered first data profile determine how the filtered first data profile will be used.

Regarding dependent claim 7, Hunt does not teach extracting data from the first filtered data profile relating to shipping and specific characteristics of the first user and extracting data from the second data profile relating to billing. Kraemer does teach a purchase command in col. 4 lines 8-45 and col. 6 lines 16-57 which requires data from both the gift giver and gift recipient in order to appropriately fill out the vendor purchase form.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kraemer into Hunt to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the profiles of Hunt to have increased the automation of filling out the vendor purchase form and thus reducing the amount of time required for the transaction. This benefit would have suggested the combination of the two teachings to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention.

Regarding dependent claim 8, Hunt does not teach automatically filling in an online form with data from the third data set once the first user has been selected by a second user. Kraemer does teach in col. 6 line 58 – col. 7 line 10 filling out an online vendor form automatically with a purchase command which is the equivalent of the third data set because the purchase command contains information pertaining to both the first and second users.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kraemer into Hunt to create the claimed invention. Automatic form filling techniques were well known to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention and it would be desirable to implement such techniques to decrease the amount of time required to process a gift transaction. It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Hunt with Kraemer to use the data profiles provided by Hunt to have automatically filled online vendor forms as is taught by Kraemer. The profiles would have saved the users time since they would not have entered their billing, shipping and other characteristic information respectively each time they enter into a transaction.

Regarding dependent claim 9, Hunt teaches requesting access to use the second data profile which may be in response to a notification to fill in an online form in col. 6 line 53 – col. 7 line 10.

Regarding dependent claim 10, Hunt teaches granting access to the second data profile which may thereby enabling a computer network user to fill in the online form. The computer network user may access the secondary profile through the website receiving the data from first user and then use that data to fill in an online form at a vendor website in col. 6 line 7 – col. 7 line 10.

Regarding independent claim 11, Hunt teaches creating a filtered data set containing data the information provider is willing to share with particular third-party users, including the information requester in col. 6 line 53 – col. 7 line 10. Hunt does not teach is retrieving an online merchant form having a plurality of fields, inserting data from the information requester, the online merchant form having a plurality of fields, or granting access to the filtered data set by

Art Unit: 2176

the information provider to the information requester so that data from the filtered data set is inserted into a second subset of the plurality of fields, wherein the online merchant form is from an online merchant not affiliated with any other online merchant. Hunt also does not teach receiving a completed online merchant form when the online merchant form contains a modified data item, wherein the first data profile is updated with the modified data item. Kraemer does teach this in col. 6 lines 16-33, col. 6 line 58 – col. 7 line 10 and in col. 5 lines 30-39. Kraemer discloses that an online vendor form, which has a plurality of fields, may be received from a vendor and that it may be filled out automatically with the purchase command. The purchase command combines the gift-recipient information contained in the gift with the gift-giver information submitted by the gift-giver user prior to the generation of the purchase command, thus the two sets of data are coalesced into one set contained in the purchase order. Kraemer also discloses that the vendor may be “unlisted” which means the vendor is not affiliated with the enhanced server aiding the user. Dedrick teaches receiving modified data items and updating a first data profile with the modified data items in col. 1 line 65 – col. 2 line 4 and col. 5 line 52 – col. 6 line 21.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Hunt, Kraemer, and Dedrick to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have used the profiles of Hunt to have provided the data for online merchant forms since an important purpose of the internet was to promote electronic commerce. Furthermore, it would have been obvious and desirable to have used both the teaching of Kraemer to have modified Hunt so that the information might have been provided to online vendors, or merchants,

Art Unit: 2176

regardless of their affiliation and the automatic profile updating teaching of Dedrick to have improved and automated the updating of the data profile. This would have greatly enhanced the product offered to the users in that they are not constrained by a particular network of vendors as disclosed in Kraemer. The ability of the user to make purchases from “unlisted” web sites grants more freedom to the user and thus increases the chance that the user would have used the gift-purchasing product.

Regarding dependent claim 12, Hunt does not teach wherein the online merchant is not associated with at least one of a network and a group of other online merchants. Kraemer teach wherein the online merchant is not associated with a network or group of other online merchants in col. 5 lines 30-39. The online vendors may be “unlisted” which means they are not part of the network of vendors affiliated with the enhanced server assisting the user.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine Kraemer into Hunt to create the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used the teaching of Kraemer to have modified Hunt so that the information would have been provided to online vendors, or merchants, regardless of their affiliation. This would have greatly enhanced the product offered to the users in that they would not have been constrained by a particular network of vendors as disclosed in Kraemer. The ability of the user to make purchases from “unlisted” web sites would have granted more freedom to the user and thus increased the chance that the user would have used the gift-purchasing product.

Regarding dependent claim 13, Hunt teaches dynamically updating the filtered data set with updated information from the information provider such that the information requester has

Art Unit: 2176

access to only the updated information in Fig. 5 and col. 9 lines 16-45. The user may log in and change the information and privacy policies an indefinite number of times.

Regarding dependent claim 14, Hunt teaches a filtered data set is updated by editing an underlying un-filtered data set under the control of the information provider in Fig. 5 and col. 9 lines 16-45. Changing the information and privacy policies at this point will alter the “personalities” or filtered data sets accordingly and such changes may be made an indefinite number of times.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-14 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection. The Examiner has found the prior art reference of Dedrick which monitors actions taken by an individual user and customizes a profile for that individual user based on these previous actions. Therefore, this teaching would have motivated the combination of Hunt and Kraemer to have automatically updated the user data profile based on manual updates monitored by the profile server.

Art Unit: 2176

Conclusion

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Cingil, "Supporting Global User Profiles Through Trusted Authorities", Data Management Issues in Electronic Commerce, volume 31 issue 1, March 2002, pages 11-17 discloses the use of user profiles which are globally available for authorized sites and change dynamically to reflect changes in user interests.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J. Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Heather R. Herndon can be reached on 571-272-4136. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
11/17/2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
11/16/2005